For the Northern District of California

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1		
2		*E-FILED: May 29, 2012*
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	NOT FOR CITATION	
8	IN THE UNITED STAT	ES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
11	MARY BASICH,	No. C11-04406 EJD (HRL)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER RE DISCOVERY DISPUTE JOINT REPORT #3
13	V.	
14	PATENAUDE & FELIX, APC. and CAPITAL	[Re: Docket No. 56]
15	ONE BANK, (USA), N.A.; DOES 1-10, inclusive,	
16	Defendants.	
17	/	

Plaintiff Mary Basich sues for alleged violations of the federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. and the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 1788, et seq. She claims that defendants improperly attempted to collect a debt from her with respect to a Capital One credit card. Plaintiff says that this is a case of mistaken identity and that she is not the debtor. This court is told that the debt is owed by one Mary Ryals, who reportedly used the alias "Mary Basich." 1

In the parties' Discovery Dispute Joint Report (DDJR) #3, plaintiff seeks an order requiring defendant Patenaude & Felix (P&F) to produce a privilege log. The matter is deemed suitable for determination without oral argument. CIV. L.R. 7-1(b). Having considered the DDJR, the court rules as follows: DDJR #3, which was filed by plaintiff on May 1, 2012,

Basich initially thought Ryals had stolen her identity, but plaintiff now tells this court that she no longer believes that to be the case.

Case5:11-cv-04406-EJD Document63 Filed05/29/12 Page2 of 3

indicates that defendant agreed to provide a privilege log and that the parties discussed that the		
log would be provided by May 2, 2012. The court assumes that the privilege log has been		
provided by now. If so, the matter appears to be moot, and plaintiff's request for an order is		
denied. Indeed, this court wonders why plaintiff believed that pursuing the instant DDJR would		
be an efficient use of the parties' and the court's time and resources. However, if the court is		
incorrect in its assumption about service of defendant's privilege log, defendant would be well		
advised to serve it forthwith.		

SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 29, 2012



United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1	5:11-cv-04406-EJD Notice has been electronically mailed to:
2	Balam Osberto Letona letonalaw@gmail.com
3	Candice Lynn Fields cfields@kmtg.com, lchenknapp@kmtg.com, mmcguire@kmtg.com, SRamirez@kmtg.com
5	Danielle Renee Teeters dteeters@kmtg.com, sramirez@kmtg.com June D. Coleman jcoleman@kmtg.com, krockenstein@kmtg.com, lchenknapp@kmtg.com
6	Lucius Wallace luke@hwh-law.com, tammy@hwh-law.com
7 8	Robert David Humphreys david@hwh-law.com, tammy@hwh-law.com
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	